



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

classes of no country ever benefit by war; that arbitration should take the place of war; and provided that the question of a strike of workers in case of war should be fully threshed out by the executive committee in consultation with the responsible authorities of every country, the result to be presented at the next Socialist Congress at Vienna three years hence.

. . . At the International Miners' Congress, held at Brussels last month, the following resolution, moved by Thomas Burt, was unanimously adopted: "We desire to see universal peace amongst nations, and in order to bring that about we are of opinion that all cases of dispute amongst nations should be settled by conciliation or arbitration." The congress was deeply moved by Mr. Burt's eloquent plea for universal peace.

. . . The president of the second Hague Conference, Baron de Nelidoff, Russian ambassador to France, died at Paris on the evening of September 17. While passing through Munich, August 8, he was stricken with apoplexy. He was seventy-four years old. Mr. de Staal, president of the first Hague Conference, died some years ago.

. . . An additional prize court convention was signed at The Hague on September 20 by representatives of the United States and the other powers concerned. This convention was concluded in order to remove the constitutional difficulties in the way of the United States government signing the original prize court convention drafted at the second Hague Conference. The ratifications of both conventions are now to be deposited as soon as practicable.

. . . The Carbondale (Pa.) City Teachers' Institute, after a strong peace address by Professor Bromley Smith of Bucknell University, adopted unanimously, on the 2d of September, the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, by the teachers of Carbondale City, assembled in their annual institute, that we deprecate the use of war as a means of settling international disputes, and that we urge the Representative in Congress from this district to use his influence at Washington to secure a limitation of armaments and a speedy reduction of the expenditures of government for military purposes."

. . . The rivalry in armaments between France and Germany has been given a new turn by the Kaiser's recent speech. The French Minister of War has ordered ten Bleriot monoplanes and twenty Farman biplanes for almost immediate delivery. By the beginning of next year France will possess, she thinks, the most powerful aerial navy in the world, — namely, sixty aeroplanes. She proposes to be as supreme in the air as England is on the sea. Indeed, she proposes to have an aerial two-power standard, and, if necessary, a three-power standard. Dreadnaughts are thereafter to cut a sorry figure. We wonder how these French officers can keep a straight face when they look at each other, for Germany and Great Britain are going up into the air, too. Indeed, they are already far on the way of aerial folly, perhaps as far as France is. And when their aerial navies are each a match for the other, what will they do next? Come down or go further up? The thing would be colossally ridiculous if it were not so pitifully serious.

. . . The first American International Humane Conference will be held at Washington, D. C., the 10th to

the 15th of this month, under the auspices of the American Humane Association. The meetings will be held in the New United States National Museum. The main subjects to be considered are Child Protection and Animal Protection. The Congress, of which President Taft is Honorary President, promises to be a most important one. A humane exhibition will be held in the Museum during the time of the Congress.

. . . Baron Mitsui, said to be the richest man in Japan, who has been spending some weeks in New York City, says, as every public man of Japan has been saying, that all talk of war between Japan and this country is foolish. The mere talk in American papers of the possibility of such a thing, the Baron says, produces deep sadness in Japan. There is never, he says, any talk of war in the Japanese papers, except expressions of regret over the war talk in American papers.

. . . Dr. David Starr Jordan, president of Leland Stanford University, is one of the incorporators of the International School of Peace, founded by Edwin Ginn. Dr. Jordan, after attending and speaking at two or three scientific and other congresses in Europe this summer, has been spending some weeks in visiting the peace workers in France, England, Belgium, etc., investigating the progress of the world peace movement. In Paris a dinner was given in Dr. Jordan's honor, and presided over by the veteran Frederic Passy. Baron d'Estournelles de Constant and other prominent workers were present.

. . . The construction of the Peace Palace at The Hague, provided for by Mr. Carnegie, is proceeding apace. It is proposed to have it finished by 1913. All countries are contributing something toward the internal decorations. It will be a work of beauty as well as of peace when it is finished.

. . . The first Dreadnaught was laid down by Great Britain in 1905. By 1912, or seven years from the beginning, there will be seventy-six Dreadnaughts finished if the present program goes on. These will have cost the enormous sum of \$750,000,000. The "danger" has grown as the Dreadnaughts have increased in number and costliness.

Text of the Decision of the Hague Tribunal in the Newfoundland Fisheries Arbitration, September 7, 1910.

Question One. To what extent are the following contentions or either of them justified?

It is contended on the part of Great Britain that the exercise of the liberty to take fish, referred to in the treaty (of 1818), which the inhabitants of the United States have forever in common with the subjects of his Britannic majesty, is subject to the consent of Newfoundland in the form of municipal laws, ordinances or rules, as, for example, the regulation in respect of (1) the hours, days or seasons when fish may be taken on the treaty coast. (2) The methods, means and implements to be used in the taking of fish or in the carrying on of fishing operations on such coasts. (3) Any matters of similar character relating to fishing, such regulations being reasonable.

It is contended on the part of the United States that the exercise of such liberty is not subject to limitations or restraint by Great Britain, Canada or Newfoundland unless they are appropriate and necessary for the protection and preservation of the common rights in such fisheries, and unless they be reasonable in themselves and fair as between local fishermen and fishermen coming from the United States, and not so framed as to give an advantage to the former over the latter, and unless their appropriateness, necessity, reasonableness and fairness be determined by the United States and Great Britain by common accord, and the United States concurs in their enforcement.

Answer. The right of Great Britain to make regulations without the consent of the United States as to the exercise of the liberty to take fish, referred to in Article 1 of the treaty of October 20, 1818, in the form of municipal laws, ordinances or rules of Great Britain, Canada or Newfoundland is inherent in the sovereignty of Great Britain.

The exercise of that right by Great Britain is, however, limited by the said treaty in respect of the said liberties therein granted to the inhabitants of the United States, in that such regulations must be made *bona fide* and must not be in violation of the said treaty regulations, which are: (1) Appropriate or necessary for the protection and preservation of such fisheries, or (2) desirable or necessary on grounds of public order and morals, without unnecessarily interfering with the fishery itself, and in both cases equitable and fair as between local and American fishermen, and not so framed as to give unfairly an advantage to the former over the latter class, are not inconsistent with the obligation to execute the treaty in good faith, and are therefore reasonable and not in violation of the treaty.

For the decision of the question whether a regulation is or is not reasonable, as being or not being in accordance with the dispositions of the treaty and not in violation thereof, the treaty of 1818 contains no special provision. The settlement of differences in this respect that might arise thereafter was left to the ordinary means of diplomatic intercourse. By reason, however, of the form in which Question One is put, and by further reason of the admission of Great Britain, by her counsel before this tribunal, that it is not now for either of the parties to the treaty to determine the reasonableness of any regulations made by Great Britain, Canada or Newfoundland, the reasonableness of any such regulation, if contested, must be decided, not by either of the parties, but by impartial authority in accordance with the principles herein above laid down, and in the manner proposed in the recommendations made by the tribunal.

In virtue of Article 4 of the agreement, the tribunal further decides that Article 4 of the agreement is, as stated by counsel of the respective parties at the argument, permanent in its effect and not terminable by the expiration of the general arbitration treaty of 1818 between Great Britain and the United States.

Question Two. Have the inhabitants of the United States a right to employ as members of the fishing crews of their vessels persons not inhabitants of the United States?

Answer. In view of the preceding considerations, this tribunal is of the opinion that the inhabitants of the

United States, while exercising the liberties referred to in the said articles, have a right to employ as members of the fishing crews of their vessels persons not inhabitants of the United States; but, in view of the preceding considerations, the tribunal, to prevent any misunderstanding as to the effect of its award, expresses the opinion that non-inhabitants employed as members of the fishing crews on United States vessels derive no benefit or immunity from the treaty, and it is so decided and awarded.

Question Three. Can the exercise by the inhabitants of the United States of the liberties referred to be subjected without the consent of the United States to the requirements of entry or report at custom houses or the payment of light or harbor or other dues, or any other similar requirement or condition of exaction?

Answer. The requirement that an American fishing vessel should report, if proper conveniences for so doing are at hand, is not unreasonable, for the reasons stated in the foregoing opinion. There should be no such requirement, however, unless there be reasonably convenient opportunity afforded to report, in person or by telegraph, either at a custom house or to a customs official; but the exercise of the fishing liberty by the inhabitants of the United States should not be subjected to the purely commercial formalities of a report of entry and clearance at a custom house, nor to light, harbor or other duties not imposed upon Newfoundland fishermen.

Question Four. Under the provision of the said article that the American fishermen shall be admitted to enter certain bays or harbors for shelter, repairs, wood or water, and for no other purpose whatever, but that they shall be under such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent their taking, drying or curing fish therein, or in any other manner whatever abusing the privilege thereby reserved to them, is it permissible to impose restrictions conditional upon the payment of light or harbor or other dues, or entering or reporting at custom houses or any similar conditions?

Answer. It is decided and awarded that such restrictions are not permissible unless American fishermen entering such bays for any of the four purposes aforesaid and remaining more than forty-eight hours therein should be required, if thought necessary by Great Britain or the colonial government, to report either in person or by telegraph at a custom house or to a customs official, if reasonably convenient opportunity therefor is afforded, and it is so decided and awarded.

Question Five. From where must be measured the three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors referred to in the said article?

Answer. The tribunal decides and awards that in case of bays the three marine miles are to be measured from a straight line drawn across the body of water at the place where it ceases to have the configuration and characteristics of a bay. At all other places the three marine miles are to be measured following the sinuosities of the coast.

Now this tribunal hereby recommends for the consideration and acceptance of the high contracting parties the following rules and methods of procedure for determining the limits of the bays hereinbefore enumerated: (1) In every bay not hereinafter specifically provided for the limits of exclusion shall be drawn three miles

seaward from a straight line across the bay in the part nearest the entrance at the first point where the width does not exceed ten miles. (2) In the following bays where the configuration of the coast and the local climatic conditions are such that foreign fishermen when within the geographic headlands might reasonably and *bona fide* believe themselves on the high seas, the limits of exclusion shall be drawn in each case between the headlands hereinafter specified as being those at and within which such fishermen might be reasonably expected to recognize the bay under average conditions. For the Baie des Chaleurs, the line from the light at Birch Point on Miscou Island to Macquereau Point light; for the Bay of Miramichi, the line from the light at Point Escuminac to the light on the eastern point of Tabusintac Gully; for Egmont Bay, in Prince Edward Island, the line from the light at Cape Egmont to the light at West Point, and off St. Anne Bay, in the Province of Nova Scotia, the line from the light at Point Anconi to the nearest point on the opposite shore of the mainland. For Fortune Bay, in Newfoundland, the line from Connaigre Head to the light on the southeasterly end of Brunet Island, thence to Fortune Head. For or near the following bays, the limits of exclusion shall be three marine miles seaward from the following lines, namely: For or near Barrington Bay, in Nova Scotia, the line from the light on Stoddart Island to the light on the south point of Cape Sable, thence to the light at Baccaro Point, at Chedabucto and St. Peter's Bay; the line from Cranberry Island light to Green Island light, thence to Point Rouge for Mira Bay; the line from the light on the east point of Scatarie Island to the northeasterly point of Cape Morien, and at Placentia Bay, in Newfoundland, the line between from Latine Point on the eastern mainland to the most southerly point of Red Island, thence by the most southerly point of Merasheen Island to the mainland. Long Island and Bryer Island, on St. Mary's Bay, in Nova Scotia, shall, for the purpose of delimitation, be taken as the coasts of such bays.

It is understood that nothing in these rules refers either to the Bay of Fundy, considered as a whole apart from its bays and creeks, or as to the Innocent Passages through the Gut of Canso, which were excluded by the agreement made by exchange of notes between Mr. Bacon and Mr. Bryce, dated February 21, 1909, and March 4, 1909, or to Conception Bay, which was provided for by the decision of the Privy Council in the case of the Direct United States Cable Company agent of the Anglo-American Telegraph Company, in which decision the United States have acquiesced.

Question Six. Have the inhabitants of the United States the liberty to take fish in the bays, harbors and creeks on that part of the southern coast of Newfoundland which extends from Cape Race to Rameau Islands, or on the western and northern coasts of Newfoundland from Cape Race to Quirpon Island, or on the Magdalen Islands?

Answer. This tribunal is of opinion that American inhabitants are entitled to fish in the bays, creeks and harbors of the treaty coasts of Newfoundland and the Magdalen Islands, and it is so decided and awarded.

Question Seven. Are the inhabitants of the United States, whose vessels resort to the treaty coasts, entitled to have, for those vessels when duly authorized by the

United States on that behalf, the commercial privileges on treaty coast accorded by agreement or otherwise to United States trading vessels generally?

Answer. For these reasons this tribunal is of the opinion that the inhabitants of the United States are so entitled in so far as concerns this treaty, there being nothing in its provisions to disentitle them, provided the treaty liberty of fishing and the commercial privileges are not exercised concurrently, and it is so decided and awarded.

The decision is signed by the whole tribunal, but notice of dissent from the majority report is filed by Luis M. Drago with respect to Question Five.

The United States-Canadian Peace Centennial.

A number of important letters have been received at the office of the American Peace Society in response to inquiries sent out by the assistant secretary, Dr. J. L. Tryon, expressing the most hearty approval of the proposed celebration of the close of the century of peace between the United States and the mother country. The letters show a sincere regard in the United States for Canada and Great Britain. Some of them speak in the warmest terms of appreciation of the Rush-Bagot agreement of 1817, which resulted in disarmament on the Great Lakes, and has done so much to prevent friction and to promote trustful, friendly intercourse between us and our northern neighbor. Several of the letters emphasize the necessity of making the celebration a purely pacific one, and of keeping out of it all military display; and, further, of making it the occasion of the conclusion of a treaty of unlimited arbitration between Great Britain and the United States. A few of the letters are given below:

Hon. Andrew D. White, LL. D., ex-Ambassador, Chairman of the American Delegation to the First Hague Conference.

Referring to your letter of July 30th, I am especially glad to hear from you of the plan for the centennial celebration of the Peace of Ghent. From every point of view it seems to me wise. We have had much centennial rejoicing over various battles; let us now recall the fact that, despite demagogues on both sides, peace has been maintained for one hundred years. Surely, anything that reminds us of that great fact cannot fail to produce good effects, and one of them would be sturdy and spirited resistance to all efforts tending to put an end to the era of goodwill which has brought to both the countries concerned so many blessings.

Hon. Richard Olney, ex-Secretary of State.

The suggestion of a celebration of the making of the Treaty of Ghent and of the One Hundred Years of Peace that have followed appeals to me strongly. The celebration should be national in character and should be of a nature and on a scale commensurate with the great place in the world occupied by the English-speaking countries who engage in it. Three things about the Treaty of Ghent make it noteworthy and its commemoration peculiarly desirable. It ended a war; it was the first step towards a real revival of kindly feeling between two great branches of the English race; and by its exclusion of warships from the Great Lakes, it has presented an enduring object lesson of what two countries peacefully disposed may accomplish towards keeping war at a distance. The